| J8MPRIVC

1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
4	v. 19 CR 529 (PAE)
5	KELLY RIVAS,
6	Defendant.
7	x
8	New York, N.Y.
9	August 22, 2019 2:35 p.m.
10	Before:
11	
12	HON. PAUL A. ENGELMAYER,
13	District Judge
14	APPEARANCES
15	
16	GEOFFREY S. BERMAN, United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York
17	DANIELLE SASSOON
18	HAGAN C. SCOTTEN DANIEL NESSIM
19	Assistant United States Attorneys
20	ANGUS JAMES BELL Attorney for Defendant
21	
22	ALSO PRESENT: ERIKA DE LOS RIOS, Spanish-language Interpreter
23	SPECIAL AGENT WILLIAM CLARK, Homeland Security
24	ANDREW KESSLER-CLEARY, Pretrial Services
25	
4 3	

1 (In open court)

(Case called)

MS. SASSOON: Good afternoon, your Honor. Danielle Sassoon, Hagan Scotten and Daniel Nessim for the government, and we're joined at the counsel table by William Clark, a special agent with Homeland Security Investigations.

THE COURT: All right. Very good. Good afternoon,
Ms. Sassoon, Mr. Nessim, Mr. Scotten, and good afternoon, Agent
Clark. All right. Very good. Good afternoon.

And for the defense?

MR. BELL: Yes, your Honor. James Bell for Ms. Rivas.

THE COURT: All right. Good afternoon, Mr. Bell, and good afternoon, Ms. Rivas.

Let me begin with the government. This is our initial conference in the case. Can you begin just by giving me the dates of the return of the indictment and the defendant's arraignment?

MS. SASSOON: I apologize, your Honor. I was so focused on bail, I actually have to pull that up.

THE COURT: We'll get to bail, but I'm going to put that towards the back end.

MS. SASSOON: The defendant was arraigned on August 14th, that was Wednesday of last week, and the indictment was returned several weeks before because the defendant was transported from Virginia, where she was

arrested.

THE COURT: And there was no complaint in the case, correct?

MS. SASSOON: There was no complaint, and I can provide your Honor with the exact date. July 23rd.

THE COURT: All right. I assume time was excluded as of the point of the arraignment?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Because there's no complaint here, the speedy trial clock begins to run with the arraignment, as opposed to the arrest?

MS. SASSOON: That's correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: I think that's right. All right. Very good. Tell me about the charges in the case.

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor. The defendant is charged in one count with conspiracy to commit extortion in violation of 18, U.S.C., Section 1951, and I can describe what's in the indictment, as well as the types of evidence that would be produced in the discovery, if that would be helpful.

THE COURT: I will get to discovery in a moment.

Right now, I just want to understand what the allegations are as to what happened.

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor. The allegation is that the defendant was a high-ranking member within MS-13, and that as part of her role within that organization, she extorted

other members of that organization through the collection of dues for the enterprise. And in the course of that, there were threats of violence and actual infliction of violence for the failure to pay dues.

THE COURT: And when you say she is a high-ranking member and that she extorted other members for dues, can you unpack that a little more?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor. So MS-13 is an enterprise that operates in El Salvador and the United States, among other places. It's a violent gang that engages in murder, assault, narcotics trafficking, and firearms trafficking, among other crimes.

Within the United States, the organization is divided into a number of programs, also known as "cliques," and among those cliques is a click named Hollywood Los Salvatrucha, which for short is HLS.

THE COURT: Yes, I noted that.

MS. SASSOON: Within that particular clique, the defendant, at a certain point, became what's called the "first word," which is, in effect, a manager of that clique, and in managing that clique, the defendant was actually in charge of MS-13 HLS members throughout the United States and, in particular, on the eastern seaboard within a number of states, including Virginia, Maryland, New York, Washington, D.C., among other places.

In that role as a clique leader, among other things, the defendant was responsible for extorting dues but also directing certain gang activity, coordinating, for example, shipment of firearms and narcotics, approving acts of violence and actually transmitting dues to other MS-13 members, including those in El Salvador and in prison.

THE COURT: Did Ms. Rivas participate in acts of violence herself, to your knowledge?

MS. SASSOON: She has directed acts of violence, but not herself engaged in violence, as far as we know.

THE COURT: All right. I imagine we'll get into a little more detail when it comes to bail, but that's very helpful for the purposes of understanding the case. Tell me about the rule 16 evidence.

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor. So there's a variety of evidence in this case. Among other things, there was a wiretap on Ms. Rivas' phone this year, between April and May. Ms. Rivas was also intercepted on a wiretap of another MS-13 member's phone. There have been a number of warrants executed in this case including a GPS warrant, a search warrant on Ms. Rivas' premises in June of this year, a search of her cell phone resulting from that premises search warrant and also on her consent, an iCloud search warrant.

Following the premises search warrant in June,

Ms. Rivas made a noncustodial statement to law enforcement, and

there are also a number of subpoena returns in this case, most notably, Western Union and MoneyGram records showing money transfers by Ms. Rivas to other members of the MS-13.

THE COURT: Just in terms of the rule 16 volume, you've identified a number of means of data collection.

Wiretaps sounds like potentially the most bulky. How voluminous are the returns on the wiretap?

MS. SASSOON: Your Honor, Ms. Rivas' phone was intercepted for 30 days, and there were calls throughout that period.

THE COURT: All right. Are there line sheets?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. What about the search of her home, what sort of fruits do we have there?

MS. SASSOON: The primary fruits are what came off her cell phone, but documents were also seized in the course of that search.

THE COURT: All right. How long until you can produce rule 16 discovery to the defense?

MS. SASSOON: Three weeks, ideally, and we can produce on a rolling basis.

THE COURT: All right. As you know, just having had prior cases before me, at the initial conference, in addition to identifying the scope of rule 16, which you've done, I'm eager to understand what, if any, Fourth or Fifth Amendment or

Sixth Amendment events have been used, and you've already, I think, largely touched on that.

The reason I want to break it out is so that Mr. Bell is on notice of at least potential areas for suppression motions so that I can direct that at a second conference, he let us know what suppression motions he might be making.

Hearing you speak, I pick up the Title III?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: The home search, which was pursuant to a warrant. There is, I take it, a separate Title III of a different MS-13 member?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: There is the cell phone search, which was pursuant to a warrant or consent to --

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: -- or both?

MS. SASSOON: So within the premises search warrant, there was language about searching any electronic evidence seized in the course of that search. The phone was seized in the course of that search. In addition, Ms. Rivas provided her consent to search that home.

THE COURT: I see. But you've got alternative --

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: -- legal bases for the search?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor.

24

25

THE COURT: There's a cloud warrant, but also that's a 1 2 warrant? 3 MS. SASSOON: Yes. 4 THE COURT: Are there any warrantless searches in the 5 case? 6 MS. SASSOON: Not that I can think of, your Honor. 7 THE COURT: Okay. And you mentioned, as well, a statement that the defendant made. Was that post-arrest or 8 9 pre-arrest? 10 MS. SASSOON: So this was in the course of the 11 premises search warrant. The defendant voluntarily went to a 12 local police station and was interviewed by agents. It's our 13 position that that was a noncustodial interview, but in 14 addition, Ms. Rivas was Mirandized and waived her Miranda 15 rights. THE COURT: I see. Okay. So in other words, your 16 17 view is that it's not custodial because on her own dime she 18 decided to go to a local police station? 19 MS. SASSOON: Yes. 20 THE COURT: But even if it was, Miranda rights were 21 given. Is that statement memorialized on video? 22 MS. SASSOON: It is. 23 THE COURT: Okay. So you've reviewed that, and from

your perspective, the Miranda warning is given properly?

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: Any other searches or seizures or statements?

MS. SASSOON: Yes. The agents involved in this case did speak with Ms. Rivas several months before the premises search warrant, to give her notice of certain obligations if one is to act as a money remitter. That was documented in photographs and also a recording. I don't know that we would intend to introduce that, but it will be part of the discovery.

THE COURT: But that's a statement made in a noncustodial context, I take it?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. I just want to make sure we've covered now all the rule 16, at least that is that you can presently recall.

MS. SASSOON: In addition, there might be some law enforcement reports related to prior encounters the defendant has had with law enforcement.

MR. BELL: I missed that last part, I'm sorry. Prior?

MS. SASSOON: Encounters she has had with law
enforcement.

THE COURT: Are you able to elaborate on that?

MS. SASSOON: Yes. And I can also elaborate during the bail argument, but the defendant has previously made statements to law enforcement. For example, in 2011, she was present when a boyfriend, who was an MS-13 member, was

arrested, and she made a statement to law enforcement about knowing that the boyfriend was a member of MS-13.

In 2014, she was the get-away driver, after a shooting committed by several MS-13 members, and I believe she was arrested.

THE COURT: Arrested, but not charged thereafter?

MS. SASSOON: Correct.

THE COURT: Okay.

MS. SASSOON: In addition, as my colleague has pointed out, we'll also be producing some cell phone contents recovered from another MS-13 member's phone that will include communications with Ms. Rivas, as well as communications about Ms. Rivas.

THE COURT: Okay. Do you have a current estimate of the length of the trial?

MS. SASSOON: Your Honor, we expect that we will be superseding in this case. As you might have picked up on, the indictment has the flavor of a RICO indictment, and we anticipate superseding with racketeering charges.

THE COURT: Do you expect to be superseding with substantive counts keyed to specific incidents? Right now, I see that it's an extortion conspiracy, but it sounds as if, from some of the evidence you've proffered, you've got particular incidents in mind.

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor. In addition to

extortion predicates, we expect to include additional predicates that involve violence, including murders committed by MS-13, not by this particular defendant, but as part of HLS activity.

THE COURT: Well --

MS. SASSOON: Even if --

THE COURT: If the superseder is -- I'm not expecting you to name anybody else, but as it relates to this defendant, if there's a superseder as to her, how does the murder connect to her?

MS. SASSOON: It's activity of the enterprise.

THE COURT: But is it activity that in any way she is connected to?

MR. SCOTTEN: So I expect, your Honor, that any racketeering indictment is going to include the sentencing enhancement, increasing 20 years to life because, as part of joining MS-13, Ms. Rivas would have agreed that murders are committed by other members of the enterprise.

And as part of that, we'll probably prove up, briefly, a couple of murders committed by the clique. We don't expect to prove any direct connection between the defendant and the murders. We're not going to suggest she ordered them, aided and abetted them. I don't think there will be a substantive by-card. I do think there will be some proof of these various predicates.

THE COURT: The point is that you would be charging
that she participated in the enterprise, aware of its broader
objectives, one of which was murder, and there is a sentencing
enhancement consequence to that in elevating the available
ceiling if a jury were to so find beyond a reasonable doubt?

MR. SCOTTEN: Exactly, your Honor. So as to establish that sentencing enhancement, I expect there will be some proof of murders but nothing like a murder trial.

THE COURT: Understood. All right. So with that preface, Ms. Sassoon, how long do you think a trial, ballpark, would likely be?

MS. SASSOON: About two weeks.

THE COURT: Thank you. All right. Very helpful. Anything else you want to put on the table before I turn to Mr. Bell?

MS. SASSOON: Not at this time, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Mr. Bell, I understand there will be a bail application. Put that off for a moment, and let's just talk about the progress of the case. You've now gotten a preview from the government of the nature and some sense, perhaps, of the scope of the rule 16 material.

You've also gotten a sense of at least the potential direction of the superseder, and the government has helpfully identified certain law enforcement events that, by their nature, sometimes lead to suppression motions. Although, I do

note that it sounds like all the searches and seizures here are warranted, meaning pursuant to a warrant.

Any perspective on when you would want a next conference? Anything else that I should be mindful of, from your perspective, putting aside bail?

MR. BELL: If you're asking me how much time I would need, Judge, I guess it would just depend on the accuracy of the voluminousness of this material and the like.

As you imagine, even for a 30-day period of time, the idea of wiretaps could take, you know, substantial time to go through, even with the aid of line sheets, and that's just one sort of thing. I would suggest, at a minimum, four months — three, four months to sort of get myself into it, potentially get, you know, assistance by way of a paralegal and the like to help go through and chart some of these things.

I imagine, based on what they're saying, that there is this other issue of a superseding indictment, whether that's going to come sooner versus later and how that could, of course, effect things. But if the Court is asking me now, with what I have, I would imagine 90 days, on the short end. I understand the Court's position, being in front of the Court on some of these matters, but it seems like what they have laid out, especially for a one-defendant matter, is substantial.

THE COURT: I would want to make sure at a next conference in the case, to the extent that the government has

identified searches and seizures, the wiretap and the like, that you are in a position to tell me whether you intend to move to suppress. I wouldn't expect you to be moving then and there, but that at that next conference, I would want you to commit to any suppression motions such that if I determined to have that litigated early, you would then be in a position promptly thereafter to move.

I take it what you're saying is if I scheduled a conference in three months from now, that would be November, you would then be in a position to make that commitment?

MR. BELL: That would be my hope, Judge. As the Court knows, when we start getting into these things, whether it's readily available, whether or not there's any technical issues and the like, all of those unforeseen issues --

THE COURT: Subject to unforeseen issues, based on what Ms. Sassoon has proffered, it seems to me more than reasonable to expect you to be in a position to make a determination as to whether you're moving to suppress within three months.

MR. BELL: I don't believe that's unreasonable, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. Look, it seems to me under the circumstances here, there is value, in addition to setting the next conference date, in setting a trial date so that we are all on the same page and everyone can plan accordingly.

Ms. Sassoon, just as I think about that, approximately

when do you think you might be intending to supersede by?

MS. SASSOON: Your Honor, with the caveat that any decision or memo has to be reviewed by DC and we're subject to their timeline with a racketeering memo, about 30 days.

THE COURT: All right. Let me throw out directionally the following, which would be to schedule this for trial in early February, which is, more or less, about six months or a tiny bit under from now, and with an aim of having a conference in November. Directionally putting aside specific dates, Mr. Bell, does that make sense?

MR. BELL: Early November works best for me as, of course, the Court is well aware of the holidays and travel.

THE COURT: We'll haggle about dates in a moment. Directionally, does that give you the time you need to take stock of the case?

MR. BELL: Outside of what the Court already knows as my caveats, I think that's fine, your Honor.

THE COURT: The idea of a trial in, let's say, early February? I mean, your client, putting aside whatever happens in bail, your client has a liberty interest, whether it is in the form of her having been detained or her having been released, subject to the formidable conditions that you're describing, one way or the other, your client has a speedy trial interest here.

MR. BELL: I absolutely understand that, Judge. I

would say, standing here, that sounds reasonable, but as the Court is well aware, you know, when we get into these things, more time is generally requested due to facts or circumstances.

I was thinking a March, April date, but that's what I was thinking as I'm going through this and I'm looking at my other commitments and the like. I was thinking a little bit further into the beginning of the year, my thoughts.

THE COURT: All right. Look, my inclination,

Mr. Bell, is to set this down for trial for early February. I

think you've got five-and-a-half months. I would be happy for

you to seek authorization, and I will happily grant it, for a

paralegal. Given Ms. Sassoon's proffer as to the volume of

discovery material here, it seems to me more than worthwhile,

but it doesn't seem to me that it's a case where the volume

here suggests a need to put this over any longer than that.

Before I commit to a date, government, is there any reason why a trial date beginning in early February is unrealistic?

MS. SASSOON: No, your Honor, not from the government's perspective. No.

THE COURT: Okay. Mr. Bell, I'm going to put this down for trial for February 3rd, and I expect you to work towards the trial date and treat that as a firm date.

Obviously, in the event of a superseding indictment that exceeds what Ms. Sassoon is projecting now, I would have

to reassess, but she has given all of us some notice as to the likely direction of a superseder.

And, Ms. Sassoon, I think in the interest of sustaining the trial date, I would suggest that as you get a better sense of particularly acts that are likely to form the basis of the superseder if you could give written informal notice to Mr. Bell of that, you would be serving the government's interests well in giving Mr. Bell more time to prepare to meet those.

In other words, notwithstanding the fact that you have an application pending at DOJ, I encourage you but don't require you, to give notice to Mr. Bell of particular acts or areas that the superseder would touch upon that will help him focus his activity.

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor.

THE COURT: Look, I'm mindful that there could be a variety of reasons why various, legitimate government interests would be undermined by giving that form of notice, and that's why I'm not requiring it, but I'm encouraging you to do it in your judgment so that, hopefully, we can preserve the trial date.

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. So let's put the case down for trial for February the -- yes, Mr. Bell?

MR. BELL: My only other sort of point is that it

appears that what the government is saying is that they could start getting me discovery in three to four months --

THE COURT: No, no, no.

MR. BELL: -- three to four weeks --

THE COURT: Ms. Sassoon expects to complete the process of getting you discovery within three weeks, but will be providing it on a rolling basis. Did I get that right, Ms. Sassoon?

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: That strikes me, given the volume here, as entirely realistic.

MR. BELL: Okay, Judge.

THE COURT: Okay. Ms. Sassoon, I will encourage you, as I do in all cases, to the extent that there is a volume here that is somewhat harder here for a defense counsel to make sense of, it strikes me that, to the extent that you're able to helpfully direct defense counsel within, if there's a substantial mass, materials that the government regards as particularly salient, that would be useful.

I don't know, for example, in the context of the wiretap of the other person, to what degree the fruits of that wiretap are relevant to this defendant and to what degree they may be extraneous. But, for example, to the extent to which you can isolate the calls on that other defendant's wiretap that strikes you as consequential, I think that would be well

worthwhile.

MS. SASSOON: Okay, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. For a next conference, how about Thursday, November the 21st?

MR. BELL: May I check my calendar?

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. BELL: That's fine for defense.

THE COURT: 10:00 a.m.?

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. I'm going to put the next conference down for that date.

Mr. Bell, in the event your client is the subject of a superseder between now and then, I expect I will bring you in to arraign your client on the superseder and, frankly, just to make sure that there aren't any hiccups that have developed with respect to the provision of discovery or to make sure that we're on a good track with respect to the provision of discovery unique to the new charges.

But in any event, we're on for November the 21st at 10:00 a.m. You are on notice, Mr. Bell, that at that conference, I will be asking you what, if any, motions to suppress the defense intends to make. That would include not just search and seizures under the Fourth Amendment, but any challenge to either the wiretaps, any motion to suppress statements.

Ms. Sassoon, I take it there are no lineups or show-ups or identification procedures that you're aware of in this case?

MS. SASSOON: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. You will need to tell me then whether you intend to so move. If you do, I will then set a schedule keyed to what I'm learning about the case that makes sense. It could well be, though, that I would be directing you to file within two weeks of that date; so just be mindful of that, Mr. Bell. You need to do your homework, in other words, as to suppression by then. If you haven't identified a suppression motion based on a search or seizure disclosed in initial discovery as of 11-21, you will be taken as waiving that right.

MR. BELL: Understood, Judge.

THE COURT: Understood. All right. Very good. Is there anything -- let's just take care of this exclusion of time, and then we'll get to bail.

Is there an application for the exclusion of time?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor. The government moves
to exclude time in the interest of justice so that we may
prepare and produce discovery, defense counsel may contemplate
potential motions, and we can discuss a potential disposition
of the case. We'd move to exclude until the February 3rd trial
date.

THE COURT: Mr. Bell, any objection?

MR. BELL: No, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. I will exclude the time between now and the trial date, and I do so for these reasons. This is a case with very serious charges and with a diverse and seemingly substantial quantity of evidence. It's important that Mr. Bell have the freedom and opportunity to review the discovery both to prepare for trial, to assist him in negotiating with the government towards any potential disposition, and to identify potential pretrial motions, such as suppression motions.

The exclusion of time is undertaken and is proper here to give the defense the opportunity to work its way through that material and make some of the strategic judgments and assessments that defense counsel needs to make.

I would note, as well, that in the ordinary course, it is customary that there is likely to be some discussion about a potential disposition. I don't know the likelihood that it will occur here, but the exclusion of time is to facilitate that, as well.

So for all those reasons, separately and together, I find that the interests of justice outweigh the interest of the defense and the public in a speedy trial. I, therefore, exclude time between now and February 3rd, pursuant to Title 18, United States Code, Section 3161(h)(7)(A).

1	Ms. Sassoon, is there anything further besides bail?
2	MS. SASSOON: No, your Honor.
3	THE COURT: Mr. Bell, anything besides bail?
4	MR. BELL: No, Judge.
5	THE COURT: All right. So, Ms. Sassoon, as I
6	understand it, the defendant was detained on consent by Judge
7	Pitman, but there wasn't a substantive argument about bail.
8	MS. SASSOON: That's correct.
9	THE COURT: What is the government's position?
10	MS. SASSOON: The government is seeking detention
11	based on both risk of flight and dangerousness.
12	THE COURT: Okay. Go ahead tell me why.
13	MS. SASSOON: Your Honor, I'll walk through the bail
14	factors for the Court to consider, and I think it makes sense
15	to discuss the nature and circumstances of the offense, along
16	with the weight of the evidence together.
17	THE COURT: May I just ask you, is this a presumption
18	case?
19	MS. SASSOON: It is not.
20	THE COURT: So the burden is on the government?
21	MS. SASSOON: That's correct.
22	THE COURT: And by clear and convincing evidence as to
23	the danger component?
24	MS. SASSOON: Correct.
25	I've already touched on some of the types of evidence

in this case, but I'd like to discuss in more detail the nature of that evidence and the seriousness of the conduct here.

As I've mentioned, the evidence in this case includes subpoena returns showing wire transfers, and what those records show is that for at least five years, the defendant has been engaged in transferring money on behalf of MS-13, collecting dues and transmitting them to members of the gang in El Salvador and in prison and in order to support the gang's activities. And she has engaged in hundreds of transactions in the tens of thousands of dollars.

Now, that money is being used in the service of a very violent, dangerous organization, and I've discussed some of the Rule 16 evidence that will establish Ms. Rivas' involvement in MS-13, but we also have witness testimony in this case that will establish how this money is collected and to what ends it is being used.

As alleged in the indictment, this gang is involved in murder, in narcotics trafficking, and the use of firearms. And as part of our broader investigation, we have actually solved multiple murders in other districts, recovered bodies and recovered firearms that are all connected to the gang, of which Ms. Rivas is a leader.

As a leader within that gang, Ms. Rivas was responsible for extorting dues from its members, and our evidence, including the witness testimony, will establish that

there were established rules within the gang about payment of dues, including the understanding that if dues were not paid, it would result in physical violence and that, in fact, physical violence did result when dues were not paid and that those directives of violence would come from leaders like Ms. Rivas.

In addition to the direct pressure for the extortion of dues, was the understanding of gang members that if they tried to withdraw and to leave this gang that included the extortion of dues, that they would be greenlit to be murdered, and that those types of directives, again, came from leaders within the gang.

As a clique leader, Ms. Rivas was responsible for collecting dues from lower-ranking members of the gang, and she also was in active communication with the leadership of the gang in El Salvador. And Ms. Rivas was not only overseeing this extortion locally, but she was known across the eastern seaboard as the clique leader and as what's called, as I mentioned, the "first word" within HLS.

In addition to extorting dues with the threat of violence, our testimony and evidence will establish that, among other things, the defendant expected members to come up with the money for dues through criminal activity that was common to the gang, such as narcotics trafficking and the trafficking of firearms, and that in addition to her role in collecting money,

she also coordinated narcotics trafficking and firearms trafficking.

As I mentioned, in addition to the current charges, the government also expects to be bringing even more serious charges against Ms. Rivas, including a racketeering charge, but as it stands, the current extortion count -- well, extortion always involves threats of violence. Like I said, that threat here is very significant and involved actual violence, which would mean that her guidelines here are significant and that she's facing real jail time.

THE COURT: Do you expect to supersede with a firearms count or a narcotics count?

MS. SASSOON: Perhaps as a predicate. In light of

Davis, we don't expect to be superseding with a -- I don't want

to rule it out, but I'm not promising that.

THE COURT: Well, you mentioned narcotics, right? Do you expect to be superseding with a narcotics charge?

MS. SASSOON: It's certainly a predicate of the racketeering enterprise, but I'm not sure it would be an independent count.

THE COURT: In other words, right now, you're not looking at substantive counts for this defendant that sound in narcotics or firearms, even if those are predicate acts of MS-13?

MS. SASSOON: Based on the evidence that we have, she

has been directly involved in narcotics transactions and facilitating the trafficking of firearms, but the weight of those transactions, as we understand them today, is not enough to likely justify a separate count.

THE COURT: Let me ask you. I noted that she was arrested in Virginia, and I'm mindful, just as a member of the public, that many of the MS-13 cases, I think, have been brought in the Eastern District. What connects this case to this district?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor. As I mentioned, she was a leader across the eastern seaboard, and that would include Maryland, Virginia, Washington, D.C. and New York. In New York, the primary MS-13 activity is in the Eastern District, but our evidence will establish travel through the Southern District for purposes of her activities.

THE COURT: So that would establish the venue with respect to the charge that's been brought, but does that limit some of what you can bring in terms of other charges against her, the need for a Southern District nexus?

MS. SASSOON: Not with respect to racketeering.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Tell me -- Go ahead.

MS. SASSOON: Going back to the nature of the evidence and the weight of that evidence, I've mentioned things such as a search of Ms. Rivas' iPhone, and I'd just like to give a

couple examples of the evidence recovered there. Her phone establishes both the transfer of money, there are receipts of wire transfers on MoneyGram and Western Union to known MS-13 members and to El Salvador. There was a photograph, for example, of an AK-47 and I have that --

THE COURT: On her phone?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, and that was served in June of 2019; so extremely recently. I have a copy of that photograph.

THE COURT: Can you hand it up? I'd like to see it.

MS. SASSOON: Another photograph I have a copy of is a photo of the HLS flag, which was on her phone, and this is just one example of the evidence on her phone tieing her to the clique.

And on Ms. Rivas' phone, and on the phone of another MS-13 member that was searched in this case, there are chats about dues, about violence in service of the gang. There are references to Ms. Rivas, who's also known as "Grumpy," being a member of the gang, coordinating collection of dues, and as I mentioned, access to guns and to drugs.

THE COURT: So to the extent that we're talking about danger to the community, I'd welcome your saying what you can that ties her to the facilitation, even indirectly, of violence.

MS. SASSOON: Yes, your Honor. So, first of all, these dues are being collected in the service of the activities

of an organization that's involved in murder and assault, in firearms trafficking. And this money is being distributed to El Salvador, where extreme violence of MS-13 takes place, and to MS-13 members who are incarcerated on serious charges, including RICO connected to MS-13.

Often these people she's sending money to are self-identified members of MS-13, who have arrived in prison and identified themselves as MS-13. And she's communicating directly with them to coordinate these payments, and so she is the coordinator of this entire clique, to collect the money to service these activities of the gang.

In addition, as I said, in the collection of dues, she's able to enforce that through threats of violence and actual violence. We'll have evidence of individuals in the gang being assaulted for failure to pay dues at the direction of Ms. Rivas.

As I mentioned, there's a photograph of a firearm on her phone, and in terms of danger to the community, which was something I was — and the seriousness of the danger here, which is actually another factor for the bail considerations, there's a particular danger here because she is a leader within the organization who has been able to facilitate the activities of the gang from the comfort of her own home, and to evade detection by law enforcement precisely because that's how she carries out the activities of the gang.

THE COURT: The Title III that was on her phone, was that a cell phone or a land line?

MS. SASSOON: A cell phone.

THE COURT: And could you tell whether she was largely making calls out of or around her home while she was on that phone?

MS. SASSOON: No, your Honor. We do have -- wiretap information comes with GPS data, but I don't know that it's been analyzed for that.

THE COURT: Let me rephrase it. Was she in and around the Virginia area --

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: -- during the time of the wiretap?

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: And broadly, can you characterize the sort of activities that the wiretap showed her to be involved in?

Because that's pretty fresh.

MS. SASSOON: Communications with other MS-13 members, her conversations, frankly, were relatively guarded. As we learned from the search of her cell phone, one of her preferred methods of communications was WhatsApp, which we increasingly see in these sophisticated gang investigations because it's harder to monitor WhatsApp communications. So on the phone, she was somewhat careful, but there were discussions with other MS-13 members that we understood to be about gang meetings and

about dues.

And on that front, there is case law in this circuit about how if a court determines that someone presents a danger to the community, if they are a leader of an organization that's engaged in activity like extortion, like violence and murder, that bail conditions are unlikely to satisfy the need to assure safety to the community precisely because they're operating out of their home and have the ability to communicate with lower-ranking members who can carry out directives.

And of particular concern in this case is the safety of witnesses and other members of MS-13 who are cooperating with law enforcement. In the course of this investigation, among other things, we've learned that there is serious retaliation taken against suspected snitches and even murder carried out against suspected snitches.

THE COURT: Tell me about that. I mean, by now, there's a significant body of MS-13 cases. Tell me about the pattern of retaliation against the perceived witnesses and the like in those cases.

MS. SASSOON: So my understanding, just generally, about MS-13 is there's a culture of if you snitch or even if you try to withdraw from the gang, you're greenlit for murder.

With respect to this particular defendant, there are chats that we've seen about snitches, and most concerning, and this is actually something I don't think any of us have seen in

any prior case, in the search of the phones we found a screenshot sent to Ms. Rivas by another MS-13 member that was a screenshot of notes from a proffer that took place in another federal district with an MS-13 cooperator; so actual notes from a meeting with the government, exposing this person as a cooperator.

THE COURT: May I ask you, and I'm not asking for any answer that would compromise any law enforcement interest. Any theory as to how the notes from a proffer got out? Were they part of Jencks Act material?

MR. SCOTTEN: So, your Honor, not Jencks Act material. This was a cooperator who -- our first knowledge that he was a known MS-13 cooperator was finding these proffer notes on the phone. He has not testified, material has not been turned over anywhere.

THE COURT: Right.

MR. SCOTTEN: Because it comes from another district, we haven't been the ones investigating how it made its way onto Ms. Rivas' phone. I can back it off --

THE COURT: But apparently, there's been no public acknowledgment of this person's, A, cooperation; and, B, specific proffer and, yet, it's on the phone.

MR. SCOTTEN: Correct. I can trace it back one step. We know the person who sent the notes to Ms. Rivas is a leader of an associated MS-13 clique. His real name is Andy Tovar.

He goes by "Fearless." We had a wiretap on his phone recently, which ended when we arrested him for a shooting. He's, himself, been involved in multiple murders; so he somehow got these notes and sent them to Ms. Rivas. How Mr. Tovar came across these notes, we don't know.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you. Very helpful.

MS. SASSOON: Just to pick up where he left off, that's just one example of an MS-13 member, who Ms. Rivas is in direct communication with, someone who has been involved in murders and non-fatal shootings and who is reporting to Ms. Rivas about a potential cooperator.

THE COURT: You've mentioned a number of times her being a leader in the gang. How do we know that?

MS. SASSOON: Both through some of the Rule 16 evidence that I've discussed, chats where other people are talking about her role within the gang, witness testimony from a variety of different MS-13 members who operate in different parts of the country identifying her as a leader of HLS; so in a variety of ways.

And it's our understanding, too, of MS-13 that one of the roles of a leader is the collection and transmission of dues, which is established here.

THE COURT: All right.

MS. SASSOON: I do want to address any questions your Honor has, but I also I have not addressed the factor of the

history and characteristics of this particular defendant, and that was emphasized in Mr. Bell's submission, the lack of a criminal history, that the defendant is a woman with a child.

And I think, here, the lack of criminal record, in a way, cuts the other way, which is Ms. Rivas has been operating as part of MS-13 for the better part of a decade, and we know that based on information from confidential sources, her encounters with law enforcement, the number of years that she has been engaging in these wire transfers and so --

THE COURT: Wire transfers go back how far?

MS. SASSOON: To 2014.

THE COURT: And since a wire transfer doesn't state its purpose, how is it that you can take the older wire transfers and draw the inference that it's in furtherance of MS-13?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, so we've been able to identify the recipients of the transfers, and she's receiving and transmitting money to these individuals. Now, we haven't identified the status of every person involved in a wire, but some of the recipients are self-identified members of MS-13 in prison. Others have been identified as members of MS-13 based on law enforcement information from a variety of sources, including from El Salvador.

Now, so in addition to the wires, as I've touched upon, she's had encounters with law enforcement dating back

many years, and I'll just give two examples. I mentioned that in 2011 she was present for the arrest of a known MS-13 member at his residence. She identified as his girlfriend and acknowledged knowing about the gang and that her boyfriend was part of MS-13.

In 2014, a law enforcement officer witnessed a shooting in a parking lot by known MS-13 members. He then stopped the car, and she was the driver, and ammunition and a firearm were recovered.

THE COURT: But she wasn't arrested?

MS. SASSOON: She was not ultimately charged.

In addition, the defendant has significant ties to El Salvador, which goes both to her dangerousness and to her risk of flight. Like I said, she has direct communication with leaders of MS-13 who are located in El Salvador. She lived there for a long period of time and, obviously, she maintains contacts there. And given that she's been financially supporting people in El Salvador, she has the means to flee there. She also has the means to flee out of this district because of all of her connections to different parts — to different MS-13 groups around the country.

In addition, most recently, when she was interviewed at the police station in June following the premises search warrant, she was picked up by a car full of MS-13 members, and law enforcement was able to identify them as MS-13 because of

MS-13 tattoos that were visible.

If your Honor has any questions, I'm happy to address them.

THE COURT: Sure. And let me just state for the record, I noticed a second translator came in. I forgot to note for the record earlier that we've had a translator throughout assisting Ms. Rivas in these hearings.

Mr. Bell, would you just confirm from Ms. Rivas that she has been able to hear everything so far and understand?

MR. BELL: She has, Judge.

THE COURT: All right. And, Ms. Rivas, let me just say to you, going forward, if there's anything you don't hear or can't understand, please get my attention so I can make sure that it is repeated and adequately translated to you. Okay?

THE DEFENDANT: That's fine.

THE COURT: Thank you. Yes, just one question, I guess. Ms. Sassoon, you've seen the set of conditions that Mr. Bell recommends. Why would those be -- let's focus first on flight. Why would those be inadequate to reasonably assure the defendant's appearance?

MS. SASSOON: Yes. So I mentioned some Second Circuit case law. I'd like to mention one case specifically. It's United States v. Colombo, that's 777 F.2d 96, it's a Second Circuit case from 1985 that's been relied on by District Courts in this district.

In that case, the defendant was the head of what was called the Anthony Colombo Crew, which committed a variety of state and federal crimes, many similar to those here, murder, narcotics crimes, extortion and many others. The district found that the defendant was a danger to the community, but bail conditions were appropriate, including an armed guard.

And there, the court said that even though the defendant wasn't alleged to have participated in violence himself, granting bail was clear error because those conditions could not prevent him from, quote, establishing a base from which he might direct criminal activity and would not, quote, hinder the defendant's ability to supervise an illegal enterprise.

And I think that case is directly on point here, where the defendant is aware of the violent activity of the gang, has herself directed violence, has connection to the gang throughout the eastern seaboard.

THE COURT: While she has, herself, directed violence, give me the best example of that.

MS. SASSOON: Yes. Directing physical retaliation for failing to pay dues.

THE COURT: And how do you -- is that proven up through witness testimony --

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: -- is it memorialized in writing? Is it

both?

1

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. SASSOON: Witness testimony, your Honor.

THE COURT: What was the sort of violence that ensued?

MS. SASSOON: A violent beating.

THE COURT: Okay. All right. Very good. And same question, same conditions as it relates to danger.

MS. SASSOON: So that's danger, she can direct activity both of the gang and potential retaliation.

And with respect to flight, even though she's primarily operated out of Virginia, she has strong connections throughout the country and to El Salvador, where she has financially supported people in El Salvador, who presumably have an incentive to help her, particularly if it would prevent her from, you know, potential — without knowing what could happen to her case, they have an incentive to keeping her —

THE COURT: To what degree are you finding, from the materials that you've reviewed, that she's in touch with as-yet unapprehended MS-13 members in the United States?

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: Like a lot?

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: And what about abroad?

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: All right. Okay. Thank you. Very

helpful, Ms. Sassoon.

25

years.

All right. Mr. Bell, happy to hear from you. 1 MR. BELL: Yes, Judge. I mean, as I mentioned in my 2 3 letters to the Court, my client has never been arrested, never 4 been charged with any crime, never been alleged to have 5 participated in any crime. My client does not have a passport. 6 My client has not left the United States in the better part of 7 15 years. THE COURT: She came to the United States when? 8 9 She was approximately 20 years old, Judge. MR. BELL: 10 THE COURT: And her citizenship is? 11 MR. BELL: She was born here in the United States. 12 THE COURT: She's what? 13 MR. BELL: Born here in the United States. 14 THE COURT: I'm sorry. Born here in the United 15 States? 16 MR. BELL: Yes, Plainfield, New Jersey, Judge. 17 THE COURT: Yes, quite right. Okay. Thank you. MR. BELL: My client has, for the better part of ten 18 years, been gainfully employed. She earned her certification 19 20 for medical assistant, has had -- since that time, has had two 21 gainfully -- been gainfully employed. Even when she was 22 arrested, she was actually arrested at her job, where she was a medical tech for a family practitioner for approximately five 23

And even before that, she was working for -- she was a

student at Med Tech and was an employee at another -- one moment -- Home Healthcare Incorporated, where she had worked there for a number of years before that.

So the government has pointed to these allegations of her either being associated and the like or transferring money. What they failed to present is the idea that her family is from El Salvador. So she has a mother in El Salvador, who is elderly, that she sends money to.

I have taken it upon myself to look through many of the applications that she's had in the -- from Western Union and the like. It's my understanding looking at them, many of those transfers are to her mother. Outside of these transfers to her mother, she has two younger brothers. My client's brother, who is in the courtroom, I've had many conversations with him, which I've gone on to not only the Western Union, but the MoneyGram application as well.

The two younger brothers, who are in El Salvador, who are in school, she helps pay for their schools. So when the government is saying that there are people that she knows in El Salvador, let's just say it. You mean her mother? You mean her two brothers that are in El Salvador, which she sends money to, for which are the people that the government has failed to, of course, bring to the Court's attention.

So yes, does she send money to her family? She does, and there's records of that. I would presume that the

information that the government will bear out what I already know, Judge.

THE COURT: May I ask you? You haven't received Rule 16 evidence from the government; so you, apparently, have access to her wire transfers through some other means?

MR. BELL: Correct, Judge.

THE COURT: If I may, what is that?

MR. BELL: The Western Union, her online account for Western Union and also MoneyGram. Also, she gave me her passwords to her bank accounts; so I've gone through all of those means and have identified where money has come into her account and where money is going out.

THE COURT: How far back has your review gone?

MR. BELL: I believe I haven't gotten back as far as

2013, because on her bank account, it allows you to download

transactions for the past seven years.

THE COURT: So putting aside her mother and her two younger brothers, what's the volume of wire transfers?

MR. BELL: I'm in the process of putting all this together. You imagine, I was just assigned to this matter last Wednesday. Speaking to her and getting all of that, I have not come up with an accurate -- at least as far as I can tell, an accurate actual number, but I have seen that she has sent money to her mother and her brother steadily for like --

THE COURT: Right, but unless Ms. Sassoon says

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

otherwise, that's not the -- those aren't presumably the wire transfers that --

MR. BELL: Well, she said people, Judge.

THE COURT: I got that, but she's also describing wire transfers that the government's evidence is relates to people from MS-13. So my question to you is when you look through the wire transfers going back six years to 2013, are these overwhelmingly to the mother and the brothers, or are you seeing a not-incidental number of other wire transfers, even if you can't explain them?

MR. BELL: I am seeing people that I know, or what I'm told are relatives of her's and/or close friends.

THE COURT: Right, but what's leftover? In other words, I understand you're not, given the time you've been on the case, been able to run to ground who lies behind the other wire transfers. I'm simply asking you, numerically, whether there are, indeed, a bunch of wire transfers that aren't identifiable to you as going to family?

It's sort of a Catch 22, Judge, because MR. BELL: you're asking me who are these people. I haven't been able to identify them. What I do have seen --

THE COURT: No, no. I'm not trying to catch you in anything, but the fact that she does some things that are lawful --

> MR. BELL: Right.

THE COURT: -- is not the point here. The issue is the risk of her doing something or furthering something that is unlawful. And so insofar as I have the relatively rare situation of a defense counsel, who has gotten his hands dirty with wire transfers even before rule 16, I'm asking you whether they show wire transfers that cannot be immediately identified as mother and brothers?

MR. BELL: And at that point, I can't say, Judge, because I can't identify who these individuals are, whether or not they're family, friends. Because trying to get that material inside the jail to have these conversations, I haven't had enough time to do that. I mean, the government appears to have been in this investigation now for a substantial time. I haven't been there, but what I —

THE COURT: So, look, with respect, I don't dispute that she is supportive of people who, for the purpose of this conversation, I will assume are not MS-13 members. The issue, though, is really not that. It's the quality of the evidence that she is supporting people who are MS-13 members.

The government has identified a host of contacts in which it alleges she is in active communication with people from MS-13. She dated one who was arrested on her watch. She acknowledged he was MS-13. Tell me about your client and MS-13.

MR. BELL: Judge, my client continues to deny that

she's a member of MS-13. Whether or not there's people in her hemisphere, whether there's people in El Salvador that she may or may not know, I haven't been able to identify that information; so I can't say that one way or not to the Court.

But what I do say, and which I think is somewhat solidly found here is the fact that she has no criminal record, Judge. She has not fled, nor has she made any attempts to flee, when even after there was a search warrant of her home. She was well aware and even reached out to counsel to help resolve that matter in Virginia.

So if she was, indeed, at that point, where she knew that officers are coming to her house, agents were coming to her house, if she wanted to flee, she would have fled back then. My understanding is that the search warrant happened, what — happened in June of 2016 — happened June 16th of this year, Judge.

So between June and when she was arrested, if she wanted to flee, if this propensity of her wanting to flee, such as the government is saying, she would have already done that, but where did they catch her? At work. She went to work and was arrested. She my understanding, after speaking with her and speaking to her family, her primary concern has always been her maintaining her relationship with her son. She had a one-bedroom apartment —

THE COURT: How old is the son?

MR. BELL: He's in the courtroom, Judge. He's 14.

So you have family members, who I've spoken to, family in Virginia, family in Georgia, who are willing to sign the bond. Her father, who lives in Virginia — excuse me, in Georgia, is willing to sign the bond. Her brother, who is in court, who lives in — who is in court today is willing to sign the bond. Her other older brother, who is a marine corporal in the United States military, he is willing to sign the bond, as well as another young woman, who has been friends with Ms. Rivas for well over ten years.

So we have people who are gainfully employed, people who will be able to substantiate where their income is coming from, what their relationship is with Ms. Rivas, and be able to, even in addition to that, be able to serve as a moral suasion for Ms. Rivas as well.

So you have an individual of that character, who sits before the Court and is now detained, and I believe there's sufficient, in what I have here, presented to the Court as conditions for her release.

Outside of that fact, Judge, the conditions that I cited to the Court, are the very same conditions that pretrial services themselves indicated were sufficient for her release. So when speaking with her, and they made their own --

THE COURT: We have here the pretrial services officer.

MR. KESSLER-CLEARY: Yes, sir.

THE COURT: I'll have a question for you, sir, at the end.

MR. KESSLER-CLEARY: Certainly, your Honor.

MR. BELL: So when pretrial services made their own independent analysis of this matter, they themselves came up with this list which I just really cited back to the Court as being, I thought, a reasonable set of circumstances that would have allowed her to be out on the street, to go back to her --

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. BELL: And to be gainfully employed, to be able to support herself and her son.

THE COURT: Focus on danger to the community for a moment. The government's thesis is that she has been behind the scenes, if you will, assisting MS-13 in the variety of ways that Ms. Sassoon listed, and that is something that, given the nature of her role, she has been able to do it from her home.

MR. BELL: Allegedly.

THE COURT: I understand. But there's an indictment, and there's probable cause that's been found by a grand jury. I can't look behind that. Given that, even with the various restrictions that are being proposed, how does that meaningfully address the danger to the community? I get a little better the risk of flight.

MR. BELL: Judge, normally I'm in a situation where

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

the government is saying that there are these list of convictions, there are these list of contacts with law enforcement that shows my client's propensity for danger or propensity not to be someone who can be trusted not to commit any other crimes when they're on the street.

I have a client who has no criminal record. I have a client who has had no negative contact with law enforcement at all. They site to the situation in which there was an alleged shooting in 2011, if I'm not -- 2014, in which my client was allegedly inside of a car that was stopped. Allegedly, they're saying other people were arrested, but my client was not.

They're saying that in 2011, that she was present when a boyfriend was arrested, and she acknowledged the existence of MS-13. That, to me, is not a predicate or a value that leads that my client, a 32-year-old woman, who's the mother of two teenage children, who was gainfully employed, that would then thereby lead to this idea that my client is a danger to the community.

I have not seen this sort of situation where that would be the case from the government's position. I would say that when the government is saying -- showing this picture of a firearm or the picture of a flag, my question is: In what context?

THE COURT: But what about the AK-47?

MR. BELL: But, Judge, there --

25

THE COURT: Why is there an AK-47 on her phone?

MR. BELL: I don't understand what this means. What does this mean, Judge?

THE COURT: Sorry. All I can do, at this point, is make a bail determination based on the evidence presented, but it is suggestive to have a photograph of an AK-47 on one's phone. What's the benign way to look at that?

MR. BELL: Judge, the Court, nor do I, understand under what circumstances that was found. I don't know if she's a member of the NRA. I don't know if she's a law -- whether or not she has a license for a gun. I have no reason to know. There's all sorts of lawful reasons, First Amendment reasons, why that picture could be there.

THE COURT: Look, sorry. One moment. The First

Amendment protects a lot of people from saying a lot of things.

It doesn't mean that there isn't evidentiary force to what you say. People are accountable for their words. They're accountable for the photographs they display.

Just because she has a First Amendment right to put something on her phone doesn't mean the First Amendment prevents it from being used against her if it is a building block towards showing danger.

I'm asking you -- I'm giving you an opportunity, if there's something fruitful that can be said to explain the AK-47. That's a new one on me, an AK-47 on the phone.

MR. BELL: My understanding is that there was a picture. The Court indicated that it was displayed. I have no information that it was ever displayed. I have no information whether or not this thing was sent to her. I have no information whether she sent it to someone else.

THE COURT: Let's pin this down. Ms. Sassoon, in what part of the phone was the photo of the AK-47 found?

MS. SASSOON: It was served in her photographs, and it had been saved in June of 2019.

THE COURT: Any context you want to -- I mean, I'm happy if you want to confer with your client or not, but if there's some context, I would welcome that because it is troubling to me.

MR. BELL: I understand it could be troubling, Judge, but again, I point to the fact that even if it is true that she saved it on her phone, she's never been — she is not, in this case — the government's own acknowledgment is not likely to have a charge, substantive charge of a gun charge.

The government is saying she is not likely to be charged with a substantive charge of narcotics, Judge. So they never found her with a gun. They don't believe that she ever possessed a gun. They don't believe that there is a -- the search warrant that I understand that they served found phones, not guns, not narcotics.

We're seeing a picture of a gun that we don't know to

what extent on why or what -- just because there was a picture, now knowing, under what the government now acknowledges, that she will not be charged substantively with a gun, will not be charged substantively with narcotics. The fact that they would bring up a picture of a gun here seems to be misplaced to me.

I understand why the government would want to do that.

It's sensationalizing it, saying that she had a picture of a gun, but they also acknowledge that she did not personally participate in any acts of violence.

THE COURT: I got that. Tell me about your thoughts on the other photograph. This is, I gather, an insignia or flag, rather, of the HLS subset of MS-13. That's what's represented. What's your response?

MR. BELL: My response would be the same, Judge. What does it mean? It's not -- in my estimation, the way I see it, does it mean that she is dangerous? Does it mean that because she has a picture of this flag, that she herself possessed a gun, actively participated in any acts of violence?

Again, I go back to my base position. She's never been charged with any acts of violence. She has no criminal record whatsoever. She was gainfully employed. If she wanted to flee the jurisdiction after this acknowledgment from the federal government that there is a search, she could have.

There was no acts of violence either before or after the search warrant. The government alleges that she

voluntarily goes to the precinct with law enforcement.

Presumably their position is that she did so voluntarily in a method to assist in the investigation. That, in my mind, does not point to someone who is a danger. She didn't feel a fear.

Someone who is allegedly a member of or a leader of MS-13, the government's position is that they — that that person voluntarily goes with officers to a precinct to have a conversation as part of the investigation. That, to me, does not sound like someone who was either a risk of flight or a danger to the community.

If we are surmising her actions, if we are surmising from her conduct, if we are surmising from her criminal record, if we are surmising from her employment, her duty to her family and that she supports her family not only here in the United States but also abroad, none of those points, as I see it, from the government's argument, seems to point to someone who is a risk of flight or someone who is a danger to the community.

One moment, Judge. I just want to review my notes. (Pause)

One point. Ms. Sassoon spoke to the Court regarding these alleged conversations on the wiretap, and I believe her characterization was that she was being careful and/or guarded. That's a characterization that the government has made. I have not seen those statements, but it appears to me that that's sort of a, was she being guarded or cautious, or was she just

having a conversation?

The government's characterization of a statement for which the government was not able to surmise illegal conduct said that it was guarded or careful. In my estimation either she's talking about committing violence or the threat of violence, either she's talking about the idea that she's fleeing from the jurisdiction and would give the Court reason to believe that she is fleeing from the jurisdiction, those are the issues.

She brings up the issue of whether or not these are broader conversations. I take from that that the government found that these conversations did not indicate actual criminal activity, did not indicate that she would be a danger to the community, did not indicate that she would be a flight risk.

Sorry.

(Pause)

THE COURT: Apologize for the delay.

MR. BELL: I would say as far as the issue of where —
if the Court were to set some conditions, there are various
locations here within the jurisdiction that we believe that we
could have her reside. It would, of course, be our position
that she be allowed to go back to her employment, where she was
gainfully employed and the like.

If the Court sees that as a potential issue because of it being that she would be in Virginia, although there are

definitely cases for which this Court and others have allowed people to go back to their lives and then commute back from their home state. I've spoken with the family, her father, and they would be able, with other family here in New York, would be in a position to make sure that she would be able to reside here in the Southern District of New York.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you, Mr. Bell.

Let me just ask a few follow-up questions of the government. Let's just come back to the proffer notes. Those were found on her phone, correct?

MS. SASSOON: Yes. Yes.

THE COURT: And wire transfers --

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: -- defense counsel says that he's able to isolate some wire transfers that are for the family. Are you relying on those at all in your application?

MS. SASSOON: No, your Honor, and I'd like to make three points, and one is with respect to that.

As your Honor inferred, we're not claiming every single transaction was an MS-13 transaction. What I can represent to the Court is that of over 250 transactions between 2014 and 2019, law enforcement agents on this case have identified 146 transfers being made to and from MS-13 members.

THE COURT: And those exclude the mother and the brothers?

MS. SASSOON: I'm assuming that that's the case. If there are about a hundred that were not to known MS-13 members, I think the family would be in that category, but I can give a few concrete examples of the types of transfers that have been identified. For example, 47 transfers were made --

THE COURT: Seven or 47?

MS. SASSOON: -- 47 to and from an MS-13 member, who's indicted in the Western District of North Carolina for racketeering conspiracy. Twenty transfers were made to another MS-13 member, who's incarcerated in the BOP, and who has self-identified as MS-13.

MR. BELL: I'm sorry, I missed the number.

MS. SASSOON: Twenty. The defendant has sent and received payments from another individual, who's imprisoned Maryland for his involvement in an MS-13 homicide on Long Island. With respect to El Salvador, law enforcement agents have identified dozens of payments to individuals in El Salvador who are documented MS-13 members, and my understanding is that that is based primarily on law enforcement intelligence and criminal history of these individuals.

So those are just some examples to illustrate the ways in which we've identified payments.

THE COURT: A question or two about that. What dollar amount are we talking about of your typical wire transfers to

the people you're talking abou

MS. SASSOON: Small increments, about a hundred dollars.

THE COURT: And if money is going out, it's coming in from somewhere. Are there wire transfers in, beyond her employment?

MS. SASSOON: Yes, including from some of the people I identified.

THE COURT: Okay. So these are wire transfers in, as well as out?

MS. SASSOON: Yes.

THE COURT: And the 47, for example, I think you described, and maybe I miswrote it. I wrote it down as out. Is that actually in and out?

MS. SASSOON: Those were out.

THE COURT: Tell me about the money coming in. That's interesting.

MS. SASSOON: So with respect to the notes I have here with me, there are documented payments from inmates who are actually in prison. And with respect to the methods of collection, our understanding from witnesses is that the defendant would sometimes direct MS-13 members to directly transfer money to other MS-13 members or into different accounts, other than the one that's in her name.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you.

MS. SASSOON: So that was one point I wanted to address.

Two more points. With respect to the lack of criminal history, as I mentioned before, it's common for leaders within a criminal organization to be harder to catch, and it's easier for them to successfully evade law enforcement for a long period of time. And here, there's evidence of sustained involvement with a gang, and I've identified some of the ways we know that.

The fact that she didn't flee the day of the search, when there was no arrest warrant for her, isn't particularly surprising or notable, given that she has evaded law enforcement all this time, including when they've appeared on her doorstep or arrested other people.

THE COURT: Well, I mean, to Mr. Bell's point as to the risk of flight, as opposed to the danger to the community factor, the fact that law enforcement is on her tail enough to do a search warrant and she still doesn't flee, does say something about her appetite for flight.

MS. SASSOON: Well, at the time of the search, for one thing, law enforcement agents came upon her trying to wipe her phone, and they seized the phone as she was in the course of trying to do that, but there is a substantial --

THE COURT: What observation did they make that indicated that she was trying to wipe her phone.

MS. SASSOON: She was on the actual screen that allows you to select wiping the phone.

And I would submit that there is a difference between a search and actually facing a federal indictment. And the fact that she voluntarily went and gave an interview, while she lied in that interview, and so again, our conclusion from that is that she thought she could successfully evade prosecution again.

One point about the rule 16 evidence that goes to danger, some of these warrant applications contain information about witness statements, and it is possible that, in reading these warrants, the defendant will make certain inferences about who these witnesses are, which is of grave concern to the government, especially because some of the people we've mentioned she's had direct contact with, are people who have not only been involved in violence, but the type of brutal violence that MS-13 is notorious for, including committing murders because someone makes the wrong hand gesture or signal. And so you can imagine the types of things they would do to someone suspected of cooperating at the defendant's direction.

With respect to the fact that we stated she was guarded in the wiretap, I thought I could give an example, to give your Honor a flavor of that. For example, some of the calls she talks about soccer games, and it's our understanding from our witnesses that that's actually a reference to MS-13

gang-related meetings, and so there's coded language.

THE COURT: Who is she speaking to when she says soccer games?

MS. SASSOON: Identified MS-13 members.

THE COURT: As opposed to the mother or brothers?

MS. SASSOON: Correct. And as I mentioned, there are other forms of communications, like chats, where she's less guarded. If your Honor has further questions --

THE COURT: I don't. Let me just thank you, though, very much.

Let me just direct myself for a quick moment to the pretrial services officer, and then we'll take a quick break.

MS. SASSOON: Your Honor, I just wanted to correct one thing. Mr. Bell referred to the fact that we didn't say anything about the defendant possessing firearms. We do have witness testimony that the defendant directly handled a firearm that she implied had been used in a crime. I haven't provided a lot of detail about that for the same reason I've expressed, we have witness safety concerns. So I'm not asking your Honor to heavily rely upon that, but I did want to --

THE COURT: Is any dimension of your present reluctance to charge a substantive firearm or drug count, venue related? In other words, if you had nationwide venue here, would you be looking at your charging possibilities more broadly?

MR. SCOTTEN: So, no, your Honor. Frankly, there's no reticence to charge the narcotics conspiracy, which venue could easily lie here because it's very easy to do transit for a narcotics conspiracy. The drug involved is marijuana. It's not going to add anything to the sentencing exposure; so there's no reason that we would use it.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. SCOTTEN: On the firearm, it's entirely a matter of legally uncertainly as to how you hang a 924(c) charge on a racketeering conspiracy in light of Davis and Dimaya. It's not a factual concern at all.

THE COURT: I see.

MR. SCOTTEN: We could charge things like firearms trafficking, but we didn't want the Court to not see those charges and think we had misled it. It's probably more sensible to just list them all under racketeering, but it's not a factual concern.

THE COURT: Very helpful. Thank you.

Is that Officer Kessler-Cleary?

MR. KESSLER-CLEARY: Yes, it is, your Honor.

THE COURT: First of all, thank you, as always, for the very thoughtful report. The simple question is this.

You've heard a lengthy presentation from the government today with respect to danger to the community. How much of that did you know when you made your recommendation to me?

MR. KESSLER-CLEARY: Very little, your Honor. I was in touch with the government after my interview with Ms. Rivas. As the Court is aware, pretrial can only, to a certain extent, take into account the facts of the case. The nature of the instant offense is a concern that was noted both in the assessment of danger and non-appearance.

THE COURT: Here's the bottom line question.

MR. KESSLER-CLEARY: Certainly.

THE COURT: At the time you prepared your report, you had the very limited knowledge you had?

MR. KESSLER-CLEARY: Yes.

THE COURT: You've now had the benefit of an hour of colloquy, in which, among other things, the government has made representations about its proof. Does pretrial stand by its recommendation?

MR. KESSLER-CLEARY: Based upon some of the specific information posed by the government, I think, at a minimum, it would raise supervision concerns and whether specifically our assertion or recommendation of location monitoring would adequately account for a danger to the community.

The recommendation for home detention enforced by GPS is based on an understanding that we would know where the defendant is, but it does not allow us to know what's happening when they're in a given location.

THE COURT: Given the way that Ms. Sassoon has

described the nature of the defendant, which is something of a puppeteer behind the scenes, does that make you rethink your danger-to-the-community view; i.e. the conditions can reasonably assure the danger to the community?

MR. KESSLER-CLEARY: It certainly would add more elements to our assessment of the danger, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. We've been at this for a little while. I'm going to take a five-minute comfort break, and I'll be right back to rule.

MR. KESSLER-CLEARY: Thank you.

(Recess)

THE COURT: All right. Be seated. All right. Let me begin just by thanking counsel, Ms. Sassoon and Mr. Bell.

Thank you very much for very thoughtful, helpful, detailed presentations.

The government is seeking to detain Ms. Rivas on two grounds, on both of which it bears the burden. The government bears the burden by a preponderance with respect to risk of flight and bears the burden by clear and convincing evidence with respect to a danger to the community.

I regard a risk of flight question as a close one, and I'm not going to rule on the basis of it. I would note that Mr. Bell has made substantial arguments that the defendant had an opportunity to flee when on notice of an investigation apparently directed at her and did not do so. And an

impressive bail package, from the perspective of the risk of flight, has been proposed. I find that a close question.

There's no need for me to reach it.

I do, however, find that the government has satisfied its burden of demonstrating by clear and convincing evidence danger to the community, and on that basis, I am going to order the defendant's detention. Briefly, here is why. I fully respect that Ms. Rivas does not have a prior criminal record. That is significant to me.

As an aside, she does, however, have a prior history of being close to the flame. There are several instances, including the arrest of her boyfriend, in which she has prior associations with MS-13. I respect the fact that she has not to date been arrested, but the government has amassed substantial evidence, going back some period of time, of at least consorting with members of MS-13.

It remains to be seen what a trial will show as to what the nature of those contacts were, but I do have respect for the fact that she does not have a prior criminal record.

I, therefore, do not hold any of her prior activities against her in the way that, for example, a long history of prior crimes would suggest an ongoing danger to the community.

Nevertheless, the government here has proffered a substantial amount of evidence indicating aid, comfort, aiding and abetting the activities of a deeply violent and profoundly

antisocial gang. MS-13 is notorious for its acts of murder and assassination, including of children, and that is important context in evaluating the danger presented by somebody who's alleged to have been a behind-the-scenes contributor. That is essentially exactly the allegation here.

The government represents that, both through physical evidence in the form of electronic communications and in the form of witness statements, there is evidence indicating that Ms. Rivas has played a leadership role in a violent sect of this violent gang. It's not clear that she has any official title, but the government's representation, which I credit based on the evidence proffered, is that this defendant has a long-standing and active role in that sect of the gang.

Of particular concern to me, though, is the physical evidence that the government represents that suggests a means of instigating or fomenting gang activity. The government represents, in particular, that a very large number of wire transfers have gone from this defendant's account to not one, not two, but at least three identifiable members of MS-13; 47 transfers to somebody from MS-13, who's under indictment in North Carolina; 20 to an MS-13 member, who is self-identified as MS-13 who's in the Bureau of Prisons; another person in Maryland.

There may well be a defense for all of that, but on the basis of what's been proffered, that is compelling evidence

of aiding and assisting MS-13. Even at \$100 a pop, if that's the average or normal quantity, that's a substantial amount of transfers of material amounts of money assisting people affiliated with this different gang. And while any one individual recipient could be easily passed off as perhaps reflecting a coincidence that that person is MS-13, the connective tissue among those three recipients is MS-13.

I was also deeply troubled to learn of the presence on the defendant's phone of what appear to be proffer notes of somebody who is viewed as a potential cooperator. It's not clear how that came to be there, but there's no coherent explanation of what that is doing there that doesn't raise grave concerns about retaliation. And I would note that a signature social risk presented by MS-13 is its capacity and inclination to retaliate against witnesses against it, whether insiders or not.

Secondarily, but not irrelevant, I note that on the defendant's phone is a photograph of an AK-47. Yes, it's possible she's a member of the NRA, but under the facts proffered, the much greater, more likely inference is that this is HLS, not NRA, related. And the presence of what the government says is a flag associated with HLS, again, appears to reflect a degree of sponsorship or adoption or affiliation with a dangerous gang.

The bottom line is that the government has proffered

substantial evidence of a means of supporting a gang. To be sure, not firing the bullet, not plunging the dagger, but assisting those who do. Particularly given the means by which the defendant is alleged to have participated in the gang, I don't think that the bail conditions, muscular as they may be with respect to a risk of flight, are really up to the challenge of protecting society against the particular risks presented by this defendant.

As proffered by the government, Ms. Rivas is something of a PayPal for MS-13. She can do that from her home, and even if her phone were taken away, she could do that from a phone of a loved one or some other electronic within the home. Unless eyes are to be on her 24/7, it's hard to see how as long as she has access to any form of communication device, she can't further MS-13 in one or more of the ways that have been alleged.

Therefore, even if we are talking about home detention, I think that would simply be functioning as putting her in the very place that appears to have been a situs of the alleged activity.

So with respect, with great respect to Mr. Bell for the vigor of the advocacy and for the bail package that's been put together, I don't think it's up to or equal to the task of guarding against the danger to the community presented by your opponent. I would say this, that you are about, Mr. Bell, to

receive a substantial amount of discovery in this case.

At this point, we're all reliant on the representations by the government. Some of them, by their nature, won't be testable by the Rule 16 evidence in the nature of witness statements, but it may be that, as you become more familiar with the evidence, you choose to come back to me to reargue the point, I won't resist that, but you need to be prepared to address coherently the very concerns that I've articulated here today.

In any event, for all the reasons stated, I find that the defendant is, by clear-and-convincing evidence, a danger to the community that can't be redressed by the bail package that has been presented or, really, any that I can easily imagine right now. So for all those reasons, I am signing now an order affirming the detention of Ms. Rivas.

All the more reason, I should say, for the trial date that I have set. It gives, Mr. Bell, you five-and-a-half months to get ready for trial, but the intrusion on your client's liberty interest is now as significant as it can be. She will be detained, presumptively, all the way through trial. All the more reason for everybody to work post haste to make sure that the case does get tried on February 3rd.

Is there anything further from the government?

MS. SASSOON: No, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right. Anything further from the

defense?

MR. BELL: I think there's a matter of medical treatment. I would prefer to approach, if the Court would be inclined to allow that, instead of it being on the record, though.

THE COURT: I take it you're not asking that it be ex parte.

MR. BELL: No, of course not.

THE COURT: All right. Let me have government counsel and Mr. Bell come to the sidebar for a moment. I'll make a judgment at that point whether I need to put something on the record.

MR. BELL: Thank you.

(Sidebar had off the record)

THE COURT: Mr. Bell, Mr. Smallman tells me that the form that I have just signed is not one that will go to the BOP in a way that can be used; therefore, I think what I need is an order from you that I can sign that encourages or directs the Bureau of Prisons to give due attention to the medical issues. Get me something overnight, and I'll happily issue it first thing in the morning.

MR. BELL: Thank you for your time.

THE COURT: Just for the record, at the sidebar, I discussed with counsel a specific medical situation that Mr. Bell is anxious to make sure that Bureau of Prisons'

medical personnel attend to, and he's quite right. There's no reason for the public record to list the specific nature of the medical ailment, but I'm in full agreement that the Bureau of Prisons ought to be encouraged to give close attention to the issue, and I will issue an order to that effect.

Anything further from anyone?

MS. SASSOON: No.

MR. BELL: No.

THE COURT: All right. Thank you. We'll stand adjourned.

(Adjourned)